REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-9 on page 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,804,330 (Jones et al.) in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2006/0252490 A1 (Tulley et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. does not disclose a multi-user database system comprising an event table to store an event log of the session maintenance transactions and a session table derived from the event table and the accounting table, where the session table is to store resource usage data associated with at least one user session, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action admits that Jones et al. does not disclose an event table to store an event log of the session maintenance transactions; and a session table derived from the event table and the accounting table, the session table to store resource usage data associated with at least one user session. Office Action, page 3. The Office Action points to Tulley et al. to correct this deficiency. Office Action, pages 3 and 4. Specifically, the Office Action states that the aforementioned elements of claim 1 can be found in paragraph [0126] of Tulley et al. Office Action, page 4.

Tulley et al. discloses a gaming system that is configured for allocating an outcome amount among a total number of events. Tulley et al., paragraph [0003]. The system includes an event result server 450 that can predetermine event results, and a controller 400 that can communicate with a player device 300. Tulley et al., paragraphs [0089], [0091] and [0093]. The player device 300 can include a storage device 330 that stores a game database 500, a game session database 600, and in one embodiment an event database 800. Tulley et al., paragraph [0106]. The session database 600 includes entries such as a game session identifier 602 associated with a game session, the total time period 606 associated with the game session, the amount of time remaining 610 in the game session, and the average time per event 608 during the game session. Tulley et al., paragraphs [0126] and [0128]. Information in the game session

database 600 may be created and updated based on information received from a player device 300 and/or controller 400. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126].

The Office Action states on page 4 that Tulley et al. discloses in paragraph [0126] both an event table and a session table. Applicants respectfully disagree since the cited portion of Tulley et al. discloses only a game session database 600 and neither an event table or a session table. Tulley et al. does disclose an event database 800. Tulley et al., paragraph [0138]. The event database 800 has a game session identifier 802 that can be based on or associated with the game session identifier 602 stored in the game session database 600. Tulley et al., paragraph [0139]. The event database 800 identifies each event identifier 804 and event result 806 with the game session. Tulley et al., paragraph [0139].

Tulley et al. does not disclose an event table to store an event log of the session maintenance transactions, as set forth in claim 1. The event database 800 lists only each event identifier 804 and its associated event result 806 and makes no mention whatsoever of an event log of the session maintenance transactions. The game session database 600 in Tulley et al. likewise does not disclose the event table, as in claim 1. The game session database 600 identifies a game session 602 with its total time period 606 along with the time remaining 610 in the game session. Tulley et al., Fig. 6. This is not an event log of the session maintenance transactions.

Further, Tulley et al. fails to disclose or teach a session table to store resource usage data associated with at least one user session, as set forth in claim 1. As discussed, the game session database 600 relates a game session identifier 602 with its total time period 606, average time per event 608, time remaining in the game session 610, total wager amount 612 and remaining wager balance 614. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126]. The game session database 600 lacks any mention of resource usage data. The game session database 600 does not disclose at least one user session but instead discloses a game session identifier 602 which is an identification of a game session and not an identification of a user session. Likewise, no other portion of Tulley et al. discloses or suggests a session table to store resource usage data associated with at least one user session.

U.S. App. No.: 10/618,256

Additionally, Tulley et al. does not disclose a session table derived from the event table and the accounting table, as set forth in claim 1. The game session database 600 in Tulley et al. is not derived from another table. Instead, information in the game session database 600 is created and updated based on information received from the player device 300 and/or the controller 400. Tulley et al., last sentence of paragraph [0126]. The event database 800 is likewise not derived from another table. Information in the event database 800 is initially created and updated based on information received from the event result server 450 and the controller 400. Tulley et al., paragraph [0138].

Therefore, the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. fails to disclose or suggest a multi-user database system comprising an event table to store an event log of the session maintenance transactions; and a session table derived from the event table and the accounting table, the session table to store resource usage data associated with at least one user session. Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness does not exist based on the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. since all of the elements of claim 1 are not found in the combination of references. Applicants respectfully request the rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn and submit that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. fails to disclose at least one element of each of claims 2-9. Accordingly, claims 2-9 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Claim 2 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose a multi-user database system wherein the resource usage data includes CPU usage. Tulley et al. makes no mention of CPU usage. The Office Action states on page 5 that Jones et al. discloses this subject matter from column 39, line 52 to column 40, line 41. Office Action, page 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portions of Jones et al. only discuss a voice access system to enable voice access to a customer relationship management database. A data query may be generated to retrieve pre-compiled data from a local database. Jones et al., column 40, lines 33-37. However, Jones et al. fails to disclose resource usage data that includes CPU usage. For this additional reason, claim 2 is allowable.

Claim 3 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose a multi-user database system wherein the resource usage data includes input/output usage. Tulley et al. makes no mention of input/output usage. The Office Action states on page 5 that Jones et al. discloses this subject matter from column 39, line 52 to column 40, line 41. Office Action, page 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portions of Jones et al. only discuss a voice access system to enable voice access to a customer relationship management database. A data query may be generated to retrieve pre-compiled data from a local database. Jones et al., column 40, lines 33-37. However, Jones et al. fails to disclose resource usage data that includes input/output usage. For this additional reason, claim 3 is allowable.

Claim 6 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose a request table derived from the event table and the accounting table, the request table to store resource usage data associated with the data requests. As discussed, the game session database 600 relates a game session identifier 602 with its total time period 606, average time per event 608, time remaining in the game session 610, total wager amount 612 and remaining wager balance 614. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126]. The game session database 600 lacks any mention of resource usage data. The game session database 600 does not disclose data requests but instead discloses a game session identifier 602 which is an identification of a game session and not a data request. Further, the databases in Tulley et al. are not derived from another table but are instead populated with data received from the controller 400 or the player device 300. Likewise, no other portion of Tulley et al. discloses or suggests a request table derived from the event table and the accounting table, the request table to store resource usage data associated with the data requests.

Claims 10-18 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 10-18 on page 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of Tulley et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. does not disclose a multi-user database system comprising an event table to store an event log of the session maintenance transactions;

U.S. App. No.: 10/618,256

and a request table derived from the event table and the accounting table, the request table to store resource usage data associated with the transactions, as recited in claim 10.

The Office Action admits that Jones et al. does not disclose an event table and a session table. Office Action, page 3. The Office Action points to Tulley et al. to correct this deficiency. Office Action, pages 3 and 6. Specifically, the Office Action states the elements of claim 10 missing from Jones et al. can be found in paragraphs [0126] and [0132] of Tulley et al. Office Action, page 6.

The session database 600 in Tulley et al. includes entries such as a game session identifier 602 associated with a game session, the total time period 606 associated with the game session, the amount of time remaining 610 in the game session, and the average time per event 608 during the game session. Tulley et al., paragraphs [0126] and [0128]. Information in the game session database 600 may be created and updated based on information received from a player device 300 and/or controller 400. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126]. Tulley et al. also has a player database 700 that includes a player identifier 702 associated with a player who has registered to use the gaming system, the name of the player 704, the address of the player 706, their terminal address 710 and their credit card information 712. Tulley et al., paragraphs [0133] and [0134]. Information in the player database 700 may be created and updated based on information received from the player device 300. Tulley et al., paragraph [0132].

Tulley et al. does not disclose an event table to store an event log of the session maintenance transactions. Further, Tulley et al. fails to disclose or suggest a request table to store resource usage data associated with the transactions, as set forth in claim 10. As discussed, the game session database 600 relates a game session identifier 602 with its total time period 606, average time per event 608, time remaining in the game session 610, total wager amount 612 and remaining wager balance 614. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126]. The game session database 600 lacks any mention of resource usage data. Likewise, no other portion of Tulley et al. discloses or suggests a request table to store resource usage data associated with the transactions.

Additionally, Tulley et al. does not disclose a request table derived from the event table and the accounting table, as set forth in claim 10. The game session database 600 in Tulley et al.

is not derived from another table. Instead, information in the game session database 600 is created and updated based on information received from the player device 300 and/or the controller 400. Tulley et al., last sentence of paragraph [0126]. The player database 700 is likewise not derived from another table. Information in the player database 700 is initially created and updated based on information received from the player device 300. Tulley et al., paragraph [0132]. Nowhere does Tulley et al. disclose deriving information in the player database 700 from other tables.

Therefore, the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. fails to disclose or suggest a multi-user database system comprising an event table to store an event log of the session maintenance transactions; and a request table derived from the event table and the accounting table, the request table to store resource usage data associated with the transactions, as in claim 10. Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness does not exist based on the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. since all of the elements of claim 10 are not found in the combination of references. Applicants respectfully request the rejection to claim 10 be withdrawn and submit that claim 10 is allowable.

Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. fails to disclose at least one element of each of claims 11-18. Accordingly, claims 11-18 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 10.

Claim 11 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose a multi-user database system wherein the resource usage data includes CPU usage. Tulley et al. makes no mention of CPU usage. The Office Action states on page 6 that Jones et al. discloses this subject matter from column 39, line 52 to column 40, line 41. Office Action, page 6. Applicants respectfully disagree. For this additional reason, claim 11 is allowable.

Claim 12 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose a multi-user database system wherein the resource usage data includes input/output usage. Tulley et al. makes no mention of input/output usage. The Office Action states on pages 6 and 7 that Jones et al. discloses this subject matter from column 39, line 52 to column 40, line 41. Office

Action, pages 6 and 7. Applicants respectfully disagree. For this additional reason, claim 12 is allowable.

Claim 16 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose a session table derived from the event table and the accounting table, the session table to store resource usage data associated with at least one user session. The Office Action states that Tulley et al. discloses this subject matter in paragraphs [0126] and [0132] and in Fig. 7. Office Action, page 7. As discussed, the game session database 600 relates a game session identifier 602 with its total time period 606, average time per event 608, time remaining in the game session 610, total wager amount 612 and remaining wager balance 614. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126]. The game session database 600 lacks any mention of resource usage data. The total time period that a game will take is not resource usage data. The game session database 600 does not disclose at least one user session but instead discloses a game session identifier 602 which is an identification of a game session. Further, the databases in Tulley et al. are not derived from another table but are instead populated with data received from the controller 400 or the player device 300. Likewise, no other portion of Tulley et al. discloses or suggests a session table derived from the event table and the accounting table, the session table to store resource usage data associated with at least one user session.

Claims 19-30 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 19-30 on page 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of Tulley et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. The combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. does not disclose a method comprising determining a set of new sessions from an event log data table to form a temporary session data table, as recited in claim 19.

The Office Action admits that Jones et al. does not disclose an event table or a session table. Office Action, page 3. The Office Action points to Tulley et al. to correct these deficiencies. Office Action, page 8. Specifically, the Office Action states that the aforementioned elements of claim 19 can be found in paragraphs [0126] and [0132] and Fig. 7 of Tulley et al. Office Action, page 8.

The session database 600 in Tulley et al. includes entries such as a game session identifier 602 associated with a game session, the total time period 606 associated with the game session, the amount of time remaining 610 in the game session, and the average time per event 608 during the game session. Tulley et al., paragraphs [0126] and [0128]. Information in the game session database 600 may be created and updated based on information received from a player device 300 and/or controller 400. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126]. A player database 700 is also included and has fields in which a player identifier 702 is associated with a player name 704, player address 706, player terminal address 710, payment information 712 and the manner in which the player likes prizes distributed 714. Tulley et al., paragraph [0132].

Tulley et al. discloses a game session database 600 and a player database 700 but does not disclose an event log data table. Further, Tulley et al. makes no mention of new sessions.

Tulley et al. also fails to disclose or suggest matching entries in the temporary sessions data table with a set of request transactions to form a matched data table. Nowhere does Tulley et al. disclose forming a matched data table. As discussed, the game session database 600 relates a game session identifier 602 with its total time period 606, average time per event 608, time remaining in the game session 610, total wager amount 612 and remaining wager balance 614. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126]. The game session database 600 is formed based on information received from a player device 300 and/or the controller 400. Tulley et al., paragraph [0126]. Likewise, the player database 700 is created and updated based on information received from the player device 300. Tulley et al., [0132]. These two databases are formed not through any kind of matching function but simply through input from the player device 300 or the controller 400. A temporary session data table, request transactions, and a matched data table are not even discussed. Nowhere does Tulley et al. disclose matching entries in the temporary sessions data table with a set of request transactions to form a matched data table.

Additionally, the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. does not disclose preparing a sessions level summary from the matched data table, as set forth in claim 19. The Office Action does not point to Jones et al. and Tulley et al. for this feature of claim 19 but instead points to Givoly et al.; column 3, lines 11-25; column 11, lines 58-66. Office Action, page 8. Givoly et al. discloses a system in which a network event can be assigned a monetary value.

U.S. App. No.: 10/618,256

Givoly et al., column 3, lines 11-25. The system 500 can modify a central database 575 by adding, deleting, or modifying fields. Givoly et al., column 11, lines 58-66. Nowhere does Givoly et al. disclose a sessions level summary or a matched data table. Givoly et al. simply discloses a central database 575 with fields that can be added, deleted or modified. No such teaching of a step of preparing a sessions level summary from the matched data table is present in Givoly et al. Further, this element of claim 19 is not present in Jones et al. or Tulley et al.

The combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. fails to disclose updating a session table, the session table to store resource usage data associated with the set of new sessions, as set forth in claim 19. Jones et al. discloses a data storage system in which a user can make a query in natural language that is then converted into a database query, searched, and then converted back into natural language for reporting to the user. Jones et al., column 35, lines 35-55. Nowhere does Jones et al. disclose the data as being resource usage data. Further, a session table is not updated and a set of new sessions are not disclosed in Jones et al. Tulley et al. also fails to disclose the aforementioned step of claim 19. Tulley et al. does not disclose resource usage data. As such, the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. fails to disclose or suggest updating a session table, the session table to store resource usage data associated with the set of new sessions, as set forth in claim 19.

Therefore, the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. fails to disclose or suggest the method of claim 19. Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness does not exist based on the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. since all of the elements of claim 19 are not found in the combination of references. Applicants respectfully request the rejection to claim 19 be withdrawn and submits that claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20-30 depend from claim 19, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the combination of Jones et al. and Tulley et al. fails to disclose at least one element of each of claims 20-30. Accordingly, claims 20-30 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 19.

Claim 20 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose a method wherein the resource usage data includes CPU usage. Tulley et al. makes no mention of CPU usage. The Office Action states on page 8 that Jones et al. discloses this subject matter

from column 39, line 52 to column 40, line 41. Office Action, page 8. Applicants respectfully disagree. For this additional reason, claim 20 is allowable.

Claim 21 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose a method wherein the resource usage data includes input/output usage. Tulley et al. makes no mention of input/output usage. The Office Action states on page 8 that Jones et al. discloses this subject matter from column 39, line 52 to column 40, line 41. Office Action, page 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portions of Jones et al. only discuss a voice access system to enable voice access to a customer relationship management database. A data query may be generated to retrieve pre-compiled data from a local database. Jones et al., column 40, lines 33-37. However, Jones et al. fails to disclose resource usage data that includes input/output usage. For this additional reason, claim 21 is allowable.

Claim 24 is allowable for the additional reason that none of the cited references disclose preparing a request level summary from the matched data table; and updating a request table, the request table to store resource usage data associated with the set of request transactions, as set forth in claim 24. The Office Action states that these elements are disclosed in Tulley et al. at paragraphs [0126] and [0132] and in Fig. 7. Office Action, page 9. Tulley et al. does not disclose resource usage data but at most discloses a game session database 600 in which a game session identifier 602 is associated with a total time period 606 of the game session and the time remaining 610 in the game session. Tulley et al., Fig. 6. The game session database 600 does not disclose request transactions but instead discloses a game session identifier 602 which is an identification of a game session and not a data request. The game session database 600 makes no mention of a request transaction. Additionally, the various databases in Tulley et al. are populated through the use of a player device 300 or a controller 400. Tulley et al., paragraphs [0126] and [0138]. Nowhere does Tulley et al. disclose preparing a request level summary from the matched data table. In fact, Tulley et al. is completely silent as to these features since the reference merely discloses databases that are populated and updated through the use of a player device 300 or a controller 400. As such, the combination of references does not disclose a method comprising preparing a request level summary from the matched data table; and updating a request table, the request table to store resource usage data associated with the set of request transactions. For this additional reason claim 24 is allowable.

U.S. App. No.: 10/618,256

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

_10-1-2007_
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)

Page 12 of 12   U.S. App. No.: 10/618,256